

44 #14 / misc
Letter

Unofficial

F A X

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
OCT 01 2003

To: Anthony Ojini
Company:
Fax number: +1 (703) 8729306
Business phone:

From: David A. Woodsum
Fax number: +1 (504) 9498827
Business phone:
Home phone:

Date & Time: 9/30/2003 4:56:09 PM
Pages: 3
Re: 10/022,625 office act.9/25/03 from A. Ojini to D. Woodsum

□□□□□□□□
To: Examiner Anthony Ojini
□□□□□□□□
□ Art Unit 3723

From: First named inventor,
David A. Woodsum
2623 Gladiolus St.
New Orleans, La. 70122
Ph. # 504 949 8827

Concerning application: 10/022, 625

THIS IS AN UNOFFICIAL REPLY TO OFFICE ACTION MAILED 9/25/2003

Mechanisms as like Lin's device were considered by me even prior to Lin's patent date and rejected by me for the reasons herein below.

Lin's device, without his ratchet mechanism, might be used as conjoined with my device to replace the drive train suggested in my specification that is placed as in one embodiment of my

device. Lin's device could, as I have described for my drive train, be used to step up the turning ratio between my second member and the shaft (the shaft being same as driving stem or shank). However Lin's first member 60 is a switch not a hand-held-guide-freely-spinable-unlimited-in-distance-and/or-direction-relative-the-shaft and which-enables-the-hand-to-perform-a-ratchet-mechanism-function.

Among other effects, my device enables the user to maintain continuous forward thrust upon the tool with both hands, each hand operating a separate handle, thereby the user shifts a maximum of his body weight against the tool and against the work. The prior is accomplished without need of two ratchet mechanisms accompanied by their separate switch-mechanisms for shifting-direction-of-their-engagement, the two separate mechanisms being one for the rear handle and one for the drive wheel handle.

What Lin has done (he does not have the free spinning guide but uses a ratchet mechanism) doesn't incorporate the idea of a hand continuously holding a free spinning guide while simultaneously intermittently gripping and turning an adjacent wheel. The prior idea is key to the continuous two handed forward thrusting while operating the tool without necessity of a complex double ratchet accompanied by their switching mechanisms. Using my idea and the hardware needed to carry the idea forth into reality enables a hand to provide the effects of using a second ratchet mechanism, no real ratchet mechanism present, with the advantage of having not the necessity for inclusion of a switching device to change the ratchet's direction of engagement. Using my idea and the hardware the hand is still able to continuously, through way of the hand's never letting go of the tool, thrust forward the tool and provide additional turning of the shaft. And while the hand accomplishes the prior, the user's other hand is still able to operate a rear handle having a real ratchet mechanism if so desired and by using such rear handle can also continuously hold and thrust forward upon the rear handle thus thereby the tool.

Lin expresses that he has eliminated need for a second clutch (a second actual ratchet mechanism) therefore the tool has not a complicated configuration. In a sense it's similar to what I've done, the tool hasn't two actual ratchet mechanisms, mine does not. But the point is that: my tool allows for one actual ratchet mechanism in the rear handle yet also provides apparatus (drive wheel and adjacent hand held guide) enabling a hand to mimic effects of having a second ratchet mechanism used in conjunction with the second handle (my drive wheel) which enables the hand to maintain a grip upon the tool yet perform its other operations. The second ratchet mechanism is not present but the-effects-as-if-it-were are present with the advantage of not having to switch the mechanism's engagement direction to back up the fastener.

What Lin has done is not include the rear handle nor its ratchet mechanism and placed a ratchet mechanism in the second (drive wheel) handle. Using Lin's device on forward strokes of each handle the user does not have to let go of the forward stroking handle, one handle strokes with high speed then the other handle strokes with high torque. But while on the reverse stroke of any to-be-attached-rear-handle that is during forward stroking of the second handle, the second handle engages the shank by way of either 51 or 52 engaging 40 depending on the setting of 60. 40 while engaged by either 51 or 52 is also engaging 232 which engages 31, all turning 33 and 43 wherein either of which a rear handle would be attached and thereby 33 and 43 would turn the rear handle in the same direction as the fastener. The rear handle would either have to be released or the handle would need a separate ratchet mechanism installed to return the rear-handle-hand-stroke for a start of another cycle. So unlike my device, either at least one real ratchet direction setting switch with ratchet mechanism is needed while the other hand releases or two real ratchets and switches are needed. On my device one apparatus to mimic ratchet function having no switch is needed while the other hand releases or one real rear handle ratchet and switch is needed and no hand releases. If Lin's rear handle is a ratchet his tool does

not have to be released but it would be two ratchet mechanisms needing two switch-mechanisms for shifting direction of their engagement, unlike use of my device. Lin's device is a substitute for my device in some ways but in the higher torque cycle when the drum 10 engages the shaft, by way of 50 and 52, either the rear installed handle would have to be released or two separate ratchet mechanisms would have to be used, unlike my device.

One thing I feel to be an error regarding my claims is that the location of the hole within the borders of the first member is said to be in the center. I felt the hole in the first member should not have been limited as to location. I asked the attorney to make the change but he did not. The hole does not have to be in the center because it is a grip/guide to be held by the hand and therefore could be placed in anyone of various positions, even substantially as to one edge. However, the second member's hole does have to be in the center because the second member must be able to spin, near or lightly touching the hand, within the cupped grasping hand.

Another thought, my initial application related to this device was originally submitted May 11, 1999 of which this is a continued examination. Why was Lin's Mar 14, 2000 patent considered ahead of mine if they were the same device?

If it is so obvious to a person schooled in the art then why is it you cannot comprehend it. I will consult with my attorney.

— David A. Woodsum —

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
OCT 01 2003

Unofficial